

**From:** [Vrooman Gary L](#)  
**To:** [Cora, Lori](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Oregon Hazardous Waste -- pesticide rule -- ARAR question  
**Date:** Monday, April 13, 2015 4:44:47 PM

---

Hi Lori,

We will review this and get back to you.

Gary Vrooman  
Assistant Attorney General  
Natural Resources Section  
Oregon Department of Justice

---

**From:** Cora, Lori [mailto:Cora.Lori@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2015 4:41 PM  
**To:** Vrooman Gary L  
**Cc:** Koch, Kristine; Sheldrake, Sean  
**Subject:** Oregon Hazardous Waste -- pesticide rule -- ARAR question

Hello, Gary. Hope all is well. As EPA continues to develop the Portland Harbor Feasibility Study and the cleanup alternatives, we would like some clarity on DEQ's view of its application of Oregon solid and hazardous waste regulations as they may relate to placement of dredged material in an in-water disposal facility. Attached is previous correspondence we have gotten from DEQ regarding the HWIR rule and its application to dredged material taken from the Arkema site. This correspondence is clear that its hazardous waste characterization and disposal requirements would apply to any upland disposal outside the jurisdiction of a 404 permit or permit under MSPA. But leaves in question whether a CDF authorized by a CERCLA ROD is "subject to a permit that has been issued under Clean Water Act (CWA) section 404 or the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act (MPRSA)". Also, in earlier discussions about the Port of Portland's design of the CDF, DEQ indicated it may see that its solid waste regulations may have some application to an in-water disposal site even though the material being placed in the CDF is contaminated media and would be meeting the substantive criteria of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

Our questions are:

1. Does DEQ view an in-water CDF or other type of in-water disposal facility authorized by a CERCLA ROD and designed and constructed to meet the substantive requirements of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act as meeting the substantive conditions of Oregon's HWIR exemption to hazardous waste characterization and disposal requirements? If not, can you explain why not and provide the hazardous waste regulations DEQ would apply to an in-water disposal facility?
2. Would DEQ apply its pesticide residue rule to Arkema dredged sediment if placed in an in-water disposal facility authorized by a CERCLA ROD?
3. What Oregon solid waste regulations, if any, does DEQ believe are applicable or relevant and appropriate to the design and management of an in-water disposal facility selected under a

CERCLA ROD?

As EPA is currently considering the screening of technologies, including disposal options, and developing the remedial alternatives for further 7 criteria analysis, we would appreciate your responses as soon as possible, but at least by early May. Thanks. If you have questions or wish to discuss our request, please don't hesitate to call me.

---

**Lori Houck Cora** | Assistant Regional Counsel  
**U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | Region 10**  
P: (206) 553.1115 | F: (206) 553.1762 | [cora.lori@epa.gov](mailto:cora.lori@epa.gov)

**Follow @EPAnorthwest on Twitter!** <https://twitter.com/EPAnorthwest>

\*\*\*\*\*CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE\*\*\*\*\*

This e-mail may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the addressee or it appears from the context or otherwise that you have received this e-mail in error, please advise me immediately by reply e-mail, keep the contents confidential, and immediately delete the message and any attachments from your system.

\*\*\*\*\*